US LHC Accelerator Project Baseline Change Request

BCR Number 63

WBS 1.1.1.5.1 IR Quadrupole Cable
Title Additional Quadrupole Inner Cable

Change Control Level 2

Originator J. Kerby Date 3 May 2004

# **Description of change**

Twenty-eight additional unit lengths (UL) of inner quadrupole cable will be made by LBNL using surplus SSC wire from inventory. This consists of 12 UL for MQXB16-18, plus 4 UL for the possibility that a 19<sup>th</sup> MQXB may have to be made if the prototype turns out not to be usable as a replacement for MQXB04, which failed to reach the required gradient, plus 4 UL for the possibility that a 20<sup>th</sup> collared coil assembly may be made as an additional spare. A 25% allowance is included for possible rejection of coils, yielding a requirement of 25 UL. Each run on the LBNL cabling machine can make 7 UL, so four runs makes 28 UL, the number chosen

# Reason for change

Some of the cable currently in inventory turns out to be mechanically unstable and cannot be used. In addition, sufficient quantity of cable should to be provided, while the cabling machine is set up for this run, to cover the possibility that we may need to make one or two additional coil sets, as noted above.

### **Impact on other sub-systems**

None.

## **Impact on cost**

The budget for WBS 1.1.1.5.1, IR Quadrupole Cable, is to be increased by \$32.8k, including all direct and indirect costs. The details of the cost estimate are included as an attachment to this BCR. An e-mail from Mike Barry explaining the entries is also attached.

## **Impact on schedule**

This change does not, per se, impact the schedule, but timely cabling is required to keep the quadrupole production at Fermilab on schedule.

## Other impacts (ES&H, etc.)

None.

#### **Change Control Board recommendation (if required)**

US LHC Accelerator Pro	iect	Baseline Change Request
BCR Number	63	
WBS	1.1.1.5.1 IR Quadrupole Cable	
Title	Additional Quadrupole Inner Cable	
Change Control Level	2	
Originator	J. Kerby	
Date	3 May 2004	

# Approvals

ille	5/1/04
WBS Level 3 Manager	Date
Isreli Renssan	5/5/04
Laboratory Project Manager	Date
for the	5/7/04
Change Control Board Chair	Date
Jam AR	5/7/04
US LHC Accelerator Project Manager	Date
Rep J. Carola	5/7/04
DOE LHC Project Manager	Date
Director, DOE Division of High Energy Physics	Date

```
Date: Thu, 29 Apr 2004 14:20:33 -0400
From: "Strauss, Bruce" <Bruce.Strauss@science.doe.gov>
Subject: RE: SSC wire from LBNL
To: "'kerby@fnal.gov'" <kerby@fnal.gov>,
 "Dan Dietderich (drdietderich@lbl.gov)" <drdietderich@lbl.gov>
Cc: Strait Jim <strait@fnal.gov>, HEP-TECH <HEP-TECH@science.doe.gov>,
 "Pripstein, Moishe" <Moishe.Pripstein@science.doe.gov>
Dan,
Please process the request of Jim Kerby for SSC strand.
Bruce
CC
Dr. Bruce P. Strauss
SC-20/Germantown Building
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585-1290
T+1(301)903.3705
F+1(301)903.2597
bruce.strauss@science.doe.gov
----Original Message----
From: Jim Kerby [mailto:kerby@fnal.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2004 2:10 PM
To: Strauss, Bruce
Cc: Strait Jim; Kerby Jim
Subject: Re: SSC wire from LBNL
Bruce,
  we will use (by Dan Dietderitch's estimation) 186.5km of SSC wire
currently in inventory, to make approximately 28 UL of inner cable.
Jim Kerby
Strauss, Bruce wrote:
>Jim and Jim,
>By e-mail please provide me with a list of material that you require.
>Cheers,
>Bruce
>----Original Message----
>From: Jim Kerby [mailto:kerby@fnal.gov]
>Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2004 1:36 PM
>To: Strauss Bruce
>Cc: Kerby Jim; Strait Jim
>Subject: SSC wire from LBNL
>Bruce,
> as we discussed several months ago, to complete the Fermilab portion
```

# BCR 63 - Attachment 1

>of the LHC Accelerator Project we would like to use already drawn wire
>from the SSC inventory at LBNL. We are on the verge of starting the
>cabling process.
>
 How formal a letter would you like from me making the request, and
>what specific details would you like me to include in said letter (I
>assume an electronic version is fine).
>
>Thanks
>
>Jim

y 100 more large and a control of the control of th	Description	Total	to	Nov	Jan	- a	Fah	Mar	Anr	May	uil	1	Διιο	e o
Columbitation   Columbitatio   Columbitation   Columbitation   Columbitation   Columbitation		32,795	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		4.664	0	0
Control later   Control late	- Total Income/Recovery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Laboration	□ Total FTE	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.95	0.4	0.0	0.0
Control Cont	Total Labor	20,312	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,955	3,357	0	0
Chartel Hoot	۳	20,312	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,955	3,357	0	0
FFE	— □ Detail Labor	20,312	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,955	3,357	0	0
First Firs	—⊟ Higley, Hugh C	12,205	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,848	3,357	0	0
Carpone contact   7.315   0.0   0.	1	0.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	9.0	0.0	0.0
Handbard	Direct cost	7,315	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,303	2,012	0	0
Figure Nathanele	Allocations	4,890	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,545	1,345	0	0
FTE	—⊟ Liggins, Nathaniel	5,833	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,833	0	0	0
Direct cost   3.956	HE.	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.75	0.0	0.0	0.0
F. Aubcacitons	Direct cost	3,496	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,496	0	0	0
FTE	Allocations	2,337	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,337	0	0	0
FFE   FFE	☐ Dietderich, Daniel R	1,376	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,376	0	0	0
Direct cost	H	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fire Allocations   545   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0	Direct cost	831	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	831	0	0	0
Electrost   Conjunctions   September   S		545	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545	0	0	0
FFE	☐ Barry, Michael J	898	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	898	0	0	0
Direct cost   S42   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0	Ë	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Explications   Second   Companies Labor   Com	Direct cost	542	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542	0	0	0
Campus labor   Camp		356	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356	0	0	0
Procurements	Campus Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Procurements		7,122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	905'9	616	0	0
Hardenias   Sociation   Hardenias   Har		240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	0	0
⊕ Crates and M&S         500         0	Materials	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	0	0
Herbardess	T Crates and M&S	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	0	0
⊕ Bundens         40         0 <th< th=""><th></th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th><th>0</th></th<>		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recharges 6,582 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0
Space Recharge         5,689         0	윤	6,582	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	905'9	9/	0	0
→ Bldg 52         5,689         0		5,689	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,689	0	0	0
TEID	—	5,689	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,689	0	0	0
□ Telephone Services         0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Computer/Network Services         0 </th <th></th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th>0 1</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th>0 1</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th>0 (</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th>		0	0	0	0 1	0	0	0 1	0	0	0	0 (	0	0
→ Flugues Services         893         0		0	0	0 0	0 0	0 (	0 (	0 0	0 0	0 (	0 !	0 ;	0 0	0 (
Image: Legistrolity         Substitution         Subst	All Other Services	282	0 (	0 (	0 0	0 0	0 (	0 0	0 (	0 (	81/	9 (	0 0	0 (
Travel	T Blug 32 Electricity	393	0 0	0 0			0 0		0 0	0 0	347	76		0
□ Travel         Travel         0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
□ Training         □ Training         0	I L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meeting/Conference Expense(Net)   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Misc. Other w/Overhead   Misc. Other w/Overh		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
■ Misc. Other         0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
□ Misc. Travel         0         4           Total Allocations         5,361         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         4         4	── — Misc. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
□ Misc. Other w/Overhead         0         4           Fabrication Rate         5,361         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         4         4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
□ Misc. Other w/o Overhead         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         4           Total Allocations         5,361         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Allocations 5,361 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4, Fabrication Rate 5,361 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4,	Misc. Other w/o Overhead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,361 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4,		5,361	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,670	691	0	0
	Fabrication Rate	5,361	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	•	4,670	691	0	•

Date: Fri, 30 Apr 2004 08:13:57 -0700 From: Michael Barry <MJBarry@lbl.gov>

Subject: Re: Cable run budget

In-reply-to: <409194BC.7090406@fnal.gov>

To: James Strait <strait@fnal.gov>

Cc: DRDietderich@lbl.gov, Jim Kerby <kerby@fnal.gov>, SAGourlay@lbl.gov

#### Jim,

Where to start... The budget does include all indirect costs. I believe that this is the first time you have seen a print out from our web based budgeting tool, so let me explain terms. Allocation is a term used here for overheads (not my choice of terms, it's hardwired into the software). In the labor area, it is a summarization of our payroll and organization burdens. The "Eng & AFRD Recharges" are for the hourly recharges associated with CAD and Shops. If you remember, our direct labor rates in Millennium include the payroll burden, org burden, and recharges and then G&A is applied. The term "Total Allocation" at the bottom is the 19.9% G&A rate that is applied to the total labor, recharges, and burden on the procurements (OH would be the equivalent in Millennium to the burden on procurements). I hope this clarifies things for you.

#### Mike

James Strait wrote:

```
> Dan, Mike,
>
> Does this budget include all indirect costs? Since this is about what
> we estimated by correcting the previous estimate for the lower "on
> project" overhead rate, I assume so, but I'd rather be explicit.
>
> What is "Eng & AFRD Recharges"? (ok, it's only $393, so I shouldn't
> really care, but I'm curious.)
>
> What are "Allocations"? The total of all "Allocations," those listed
> under each person's name and those at the bottom under "Total
> Allocations," is $13.5k, or more than 40% of the total $32.8k. Naively
> this sounds like an overhead, since it appears to represent a fixed
> fraction of direct cost when listed under labor. If so, then what
> about the 19.9% rate that Mike quoted in his previous e-mail?
> Cheers,
> Jim
```